



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/706,926

11/06/2000

Rajashri Joshi

N0069US

8587

37583

7590

06/03/2004

NAVIGATION TECHNOLOGIES
222 MERCHANDISE MART
SUITE 900, PATENT DEPT.
CHICAGO, IL 60654

EXAMINER

LE, MIRANDA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2177

DATE MAILED: 06/03/2004

13

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/706,926

Applicant(s)

FRANK J. KO ZAK

Examiner

Miranda Le

Art Unit

2177

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 14 May 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.


NOTE: _____

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: None.Claim(s) objected to: None.Claim(s) rejected: 1-27.Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: None.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☐ Other: _____


ORETA ROBINSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Miranda Le
June 01, 2004



Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants' arguments do not overcome the final rejection.

With regards to claims 1, 8, 11, 13, 16, 20, 24, Applicant's arguments concerning "Fujita fails to disclose the recited wavelet coefficient" are not persuasive. The Examiner has thoroughly reviewed Applicants' arguments, but firmly believes that the cited reference reasonably and properly meets the claimed limitation. Applicants are reminded that the Examiner is entitled to give the broadest reasonable interpretation to the language of the claimed as explained below. The Examiner is not limited to Applicants' definition which is not specifically set forth in the claims. In re Tanaka et al., 193 USPQ 139, (CCPA) 1977.

As pointed out in the final Office Action, Fujita teaches the wavelet and scale coefficients at col. 13, line 29 to col. 14, line 13, col. 17, lines 19-23. More specifically, Fujita teaches "to suppress distortions in distances during projections, the UTM coordinate system is segmented into zones every 6 degrees in a longitudinal direction, and thus an overall surface of the earth is represented by 60 zones (col. 13, lines 57-60). The "6 degrees" corresponds to the wavelet coefficient in order to "suppress distortions" (i.e. an accurate representation of the data). In addition, as disclosed in the Specification of the present invention, "with a wavelet representation, the wavelet coefficient for each geographic feature can be stored for the highest level of resolution" (page 4, lines 8-9), accordingly, Fujita discloses reducing the distortions at col. 13, lines 57-60. Note that the 6 degrees per zone is interpreted as the level of resolution. For instance, if the "6 degrees" is reduced to "3 degrees", the earth will be represented by 120 zones (i.e. higher resolution) the map representation is therefore more accurate.

Moreover, Fujita teaches the scale coefficient at col. 17, lines 19-23. It should be understood that this scale coefficient of Fujita is used in order to display the line segment (i.e. a portion of the map) according to the display scaling program.

Further, in response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the wavelet transform represents the continuous function $f(x)$ in terms of a set of discrete wavelet coefficient values $F(m, i)$..., Remark, page 7, lines 2-20) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).